

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 IN RE THE ESTATE OF LARRY LEE  
COVELLO,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 NORDSTROM, INC,

12 Defendant.  
13

CASE NO. C18-1025-MJP

ORDER ON REVIEW OF MOTION  
FOR RECUSAL

14 On August 1, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Motion seeking recusal of the Honorable Marsha J.  
15 Pechman in this matter. Dkt. #15. On August 7, 2018, Judge Pechman issued an Order  
16 declining to recuse herself and, in accordance with this Court's Local Rules, referred that  
17 decision to the Chief Judge for review. Dkt. #17; LCR 3(e).

18 A judge of the United States shall disqualify herself in any proceeding in which her  
19 impartiality "might reasonably be questioned." 28 U.S.C. § 455(a). Federal judges also shall  
20 disqualify themselves in circumstances where they have a personal bias or prejudice concerning  
21 a party or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding. 28  
22 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144, "whenever a party to any proceeding in a  
23 district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the  
24 matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse

1 party, such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear  
2 such proceeding.” “[A] judge’s prior adverse ruling is not sufficient cause for recusal.” *United*  
3 *States v. Studley*, 783 F.2d 934, 939 (9th Cir. 1986); *see also Taylor v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.*,  
4 993 F.2d 710, 712 (9th Cir. 1993) (“To warrant recusal, judicial bias must stem from an  
5 extrajudicial source.”).

6 Plaintiff’s sole grounds for seeking recusal is the assertion that Judge Pechman was  
7 previously employed as a lawyer for the law firm representing Defendant Nordstrom, Lane  
8 Powell. Dkt. #15 at 1. Plaintiff provides no evidence or basis for that assertion. In Judge  
9 Pechman’s Order declining to recuse, she states she has never been employed by that firm, and  
10 that in any event she has “been on the bench since 1988 and has no personal knowledge of  
11 disputed evidentiary facts concerning this matter.” Dkt. #17 at 2. The Court finds that Plaintiff  
12 has failed to present any basis to reasonably question Judge Pechman’s impartiality.

13 Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Judge Pechman’s refusal to  
14 recuse herself from this matter is AFFIRMED.

15 DATED this 8 day of August, 2018.

16  
17 

18 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
19 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24